

BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
DOCKET NO. 91-606-E - ORDER NO. 91-1141  
DECEMBER 30, 1991

IN RE:	Application of South Carolina Electric	)	
	and Gas Company for a Certificate of	)	ORDER
	Environmental Compatibility and Public	)	DENYING
	Convenience and Necessity for the	)	MOTION
	Construction and Operation of a 385 MW	)	
	Pulverized Coal-Powered Generating	)	
	Plant near Cope, Orangeburg County,	)	
	South Carolina.	)	

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) on the Motion of Steven W. Hamm, the Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina (the Consumer Advocate) to dismiss without prejudice the Application of South Carolina Electric and Gas Company (SCE&G or the Company) in this docket.

The Consumer Advocate moves for the dismissal on several grounds. First, the Consumer Advocate notes that in Docket No. 87-223-E, the Commission has approved a comprehensive integrated resource planning procedure (IRP) which call for the first IRPs thereunder to be filed by April 30, 1992, and thereafter evaluated by the Commission and other interested parties. The Consumer Advocate contends that these IRPs are to reflect the Company's long-term plans for integrated resource planning. The Consumer Advocate contends that the filing of the Application for a

Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Convenience and Necessity for the Cope Plant would be more appropriate after SCE&G submits its IRP plan to the Commission and after said plan is approved by this Commission. The Consumer Advocate states that the public interest will best be served by dismissal of the Application without prejudice at this time in order to assure that the Commission, the public, and parties that the Company has applied the new IRP procedures as set forth, and because new and more attractive resource options may be discovered during the course of the Company's IRP evaluation.

SCE&G has responded to the Consumer Advocate's Motion and asserts that the Motion should be denied. The Company states that the integrated resource planning process is an ongoing procedure, and that Commission Order No. 91-1002 requires utilities to file a fifteen (15) year IRP every three (3) years, the first of which is to be filed by April 30, 1992. SCE&G notes that the development of these IRPs is not being conducted in a vacuum, but rather in a constantly changing environment. SCE&G states that the base-load plant for which certification is sought in this docket is planned with full awareness of and consistency with the IRP process as it evolves. The Company also notes that a significant portion of SCE&G's Application in this docket is devoted to the correlation of the IRP to the Application for construction of the Cope Plant. The Commission notes that a considerable portion of SCE&G's pre-filed testimony in this docket is also devoted to the correlation of the IRP to the Application. SCE&G notes that the

planning for the new Cope Plant has progressed simultaneously with the IRP process and is consistent with it.

The Consumer Advocate believes that a delay in this docket pending determinations in the IRP docket would be inconsequential, since Order No. 91-1002 requires that IRPs be filed by April 30, 1992. That Order does provide thereafter for discovery, conferences, and, ultimately, hearings, if such are necessary. Therefore, the length of time by which the process may be completed is unknown. The Company states that it has coordinated its IRP process with a development of its plans for the Cope project and will, in the course of the hearing in this docket, demonstrate the consistency of the planning procedures.

The Commission has considered the arguments of both the Consumer Advocate and SCE&G in this matter. This Commission holds that the Consumer Advocate's Motion must be denied, since examination of the Application and SCE&G's testimony in this docket reveals that SCE&G will attempt to correlate the IRP process to this Application. Further, the Company is correct in stating that the time frame by which the IRP could be completed is questionable. Because of these matters, the Commission sees no reason why the processing of the Company's Application, discovery, and subsequent hearings should be delayed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the Motion of the Consumer Advocate to dismiss the Company's Application without prejudice is hereby denied.

DOCKET NO. 91-606-E - ORDER NO. 91-1141  
DECEMBER 30, 1991  
PAGE 4

---

2. That this Order shall remain in full force and effect  
until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

  
Chairman

ATTEST:

  
Deputy Executive Director

(SEAL)